

Paper #5 Argument that reprobate angels inhabited the earth around the year 3000 BC, [cohabited](#) with women, and [gave rise to](#) a generation of powerful but degenerate “humans” referred to as *gibborim* (Hebrew: גִּבּוֹרִים). The corrupt behavior of these genetically distinct “beings” is cited in the Hebrew Bible as one of the primary causes of the flood. The Bible also provides two unambiguous temporal indicators to date the event, informing us that this deviant angelic behavior took place almost a thousand years into the antediluvian time frame. That approximate date is established by synchronizing the event 1) with the emergence of an exploding human population and 2) with the appearance of extremely large animals on the earth, the latter referred to in the Hebrew Bible as *nephilim* (Hebrew: נְפִילִים), in context almost certainly a reference to the mammoth reptiles referenced today by the English term “dinosaurs”.

Prologue

An essay which discusses angels and dinosaurs in the same breath must necessarily begin by encouraging readers of this paper to temporarily overcome an innate and predictable [xenophobia](#) (best defined as a fear of what is foreign or strange) and read on for approximately twenty minutes. The story we present in the next twenty pages could well be life changing. It matters little if the reader questions the existence of angels or disbelieves that the largest dinosaurs emerged on this planet only around 5000 years ago. All we ask is that you peruse and ponder and seriously evaluate the evidence we have already presented in papers #1-4 and will continue to present in the next twenty pages. That evidence is as compelling as the subject matter is bizarre/strange.

We begin by encouraging the reader to examine the first four papers in the series of articles presented on this webpage, because this material is foundational and therefore critical for understanding what follows. In the first paper we discovered

what the Hebrew Bible says (and does not say) about the creation of the universe and the ensuing creation of all plant and animal families on earth, the later event dated around the year 4000 BC. In papers two and three we provided evidence that the earliest humans known to have existed on this planet, who left written record of their existence, are in general agreement on four items: 1) that a god/God created all life forms on earth at a time within the compass of human memory, 2) that the first dozen generations of humans lived unusually long lives, each approaching a thousand years in length, 3) that this first civilization ended in a flood which spared only a single family of humans, and 4) that following the flood the life expectancy of mankind decreased gradually (over the next half millennium) to more conventional levels. Those two papers also provided detailed timelines for these events, based on extensive documentation preserved in ancient texts, permitting us to determine that the flood took place around the year 2458 BC, and that the creation event which gave rise to the antediluvian civilization must be dated around the year 4114 BC.

In the opinion of this author the content of those three papers is not open to question. Every sentence is factual, based on multiple strands of evidence. And to add scientific certainty to the stated timeline we produced a fourth paper, which provided argument, based on the radiometric methodology known as “radiocarbon dating”, that every form of organic matter presumed by scientists to have originated in the remote past, including the remains of dinosaurs, actually postdates the year 4114 BC.

And if dinosaurs did not exist prior to 4114 BC, then it follows they must have made their earliest appearance on earth during the antediluvian age (4114-2458 BC), precisely where radiocarbon dating positions them. And so our 3000 BC conjectural date for their first documented appearance, as diagramed in Figure 3 on page 15 in paper #4, is absolutely consistent with both the historical and scientific evidence. Which of course raises the question, left undiscussed in that paper: Precisely where does the Hebrew Bible document the appearance of dinosaurs? To answer that question, and multiple other related questions, we turn our attention in this paper to the only biblical passage which provides detailed information regarding activities in the antediluvian age, namely, Genesis 6:1-8. We begin by quoting, in English translation, that unique passage from the Hebrew Bible.

The creation of the [gibborim](#) in Genesis 6:1-8.

1. Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the lands, and daughters were born to them,
2. that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose.
3. Then the LORD said, "My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, because he also is flesh; nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years."
4. The nephilim (Hebrew: נְפִילִים) were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men and (offspring) were born to them. Those (offspring) were the gibborim (Hebrew: גִּבּוֹרִים) who were of old, men of renown.
5. Then the LORD saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every intent of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.
6. And the LORD was sorry that He had made man on the earth, and He was grieved in His heart.
7. And the LORD said, "I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the land, from man to animals to creeping things and to birds of the sky; for I am sorry that I have made them."
8. But Noah found favor in the eyes of the LORD. Genesis 6:1-8 NASB

Before we begin to analyze this extremely misunderstood Old Testament section of text, we should point out that it is positioned immediately following the lengthy genealogy of Adam (Genesis 5:1-32) (the only existing biblical account of the occupants of the antediluvian age), and immediately preceding the description of the biblical flood (Genesis 6:9-8:19), the event which brought that age to an end. And it is abundantly clear from verses 7 and 8 of Genesis chapter 6, as well as verses 9-14a following, that this Genesis 6:1-8 [pericope](#) has been added to the Hebrew Bible for one reason only, i.e. to provide the rationale for God's decision to destroy that first human civilization.

9. These are the records of the generations of Noah. Noah was a righteous man, blameless in his time; Noah walked with God.
10. And Noah became the father of three sons: Shem, Ham, and Japheth.
11. Now the earth was corrupt in the sight of God, and the earth was filled with violence.
12. And God looked on the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth.

13. Then God said to Noah, "The end of all flesh has come before Me; for the earth is filled with violence because of them; and behold, I am about to destroy them with the earth.

14. Make for yourself an ark ... (Genesis 6:9-14a) NASB

In this paper we are primarily interested in identifying the antecedents (and thus the meaning) of three words/phrases in the 6:1-8 initial section - 1) the Hebrew term "*nephilim*" in verse 4; and 2) the Hebrew phrase "*sons of God*" in verse 2; and last but not least 3) the Hebrew term "*gibborim*" in verse 4. We will discuss these words in their context and in the order cited.

A. The meaning of "*nephilim*".

It is vitally important that the reader understand the poetic structure of the passage in question. The post-flood author who recorded this [vignette](#) essentially tells the story twice, each time providing a different temporal indicator. The two sections (Genesis 6:1-3 and 6:4-7) each begin with a statement (quoted above in red print) indicating "when" the event took place, along with a succinct description of the event itself, describing it only as a cohabitation involving "sons of God" and "daughters of men". Each of these introductory statements is followed by an account of God's reaction (in black print). In the first section no reference is made to the children resulting from these unions. The text mentions only the fact that the unions themselves tested the patience of God and prompted him to set a timeline for ending them. In the second parallel section there is explicit mention of the offspring of the unions, the so-called *gibborim*, followed by a statement attributing the moral degeneracy in the antediluvian world to the presence of these "men of renown". God's displeasure has now turned to righteous indignation, anger so intense that He describes in detail his intension to bring an end to this morally degenerate world.

It is this stated intention that permits us to interpret the previous mention of a time frame of "one hundred and twenty years". In context this must be understood as a reference to the time remaining to the human race before the coming of the "end of the age". It is testimony to the patience, if not the tolerance of God, that He left the door open for repentance and change in this

society gone amuck. He will allow yet another one hundred and twenty years before the inevitable annihilation of mankind – reminiscent of the New Testament teaching regarding the character of the creator God:

The Lord is not slow about His promise, as some count slowness, but is patient toward you, not wishing for any to perish but for all to come to repentance. 2 Peter 3:9

Before we proceed it should be pointed out that the 120 years provides a date for when God finally determined to destroy the existing civilization, not for the beginnings of the illicit unions between the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men”. There is assumed a time gap between those unions and the resolve of God to destroy all but a remnant of the human and animal population of the inhabited earth, time for the *gibborim* to grow into manhood, and time for the resulting contamination/depravity to spread to human society at large. In our conjectural timeline, the birth of the *gibborim* is dated around the year 3000 BC; the pronouncement of the coming annihilation of all but a remnant of the human race must have taken place around the year 2458 BC (2578 - 120), and as already stated, the arrival of the universal flood in ca 2578 BC.

It may be fairly asked by the reader why we have digressed, drawing attention to the structure of the biblical passage. The answer is transparent. We want to make it abundantly clear that the *nephilim* who appear in verse 4 have absolutely nothing to do with the union of the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men”, nor with the “*gibborim*” resulting from these “illicit unions”. All that the biblical text is saying is that the inhabited earth, at the time these interactions were taking place, was populated by *nephilim*. That observation is extremely important, since without exception every interpretation of verse 4 that this author is familiar with either identifies [the *nephilim* with the *gibborim*](#), or (less frequently) with the “sons of god”. But even a casual reading of the passage in English translation ought to convince the reader that these interpretations are incorrect. Which leaves open the question: Who or what are the *nephilim*?

Read almost any English translation of Genesis 6:4 (the NASB is an exception to the rule) and the reader will see the English word “giants” substituted for the Hebrew term *nephilim*, and the giants thus referenced are understood to be the

“gibborim”, this in spite of the fact that the Hebrew term *nephilim* is extremely rare and its derivation (and thus its root meaning) is a subject of considerable debate. The selection of “giants” as a translation is chosen by exegetes because *nephilim* occurs in only one other passage of scripture, [Numbers 13:33](#) in the Hebrew Bible, where the text clearly uses the term to reference extremely tall humans inhabiting the land of Canaan at the time of the Exodus, an event we have dated 1446 BC in our paper #2, thus a time frame approximately 1500 years removed from the Genesis 6 event. While we have no quarrel with the translation “giants” in Genesis 6, it would be a mistake to draw too close a connection between Genesis 6 and Numbers 13 and thus restrict the usage of the term *nephilim* to giant humans. Clearly it behooves us to examine the context of Numbers 13:33. And to that end we quote below the NASB translation of the relevant verses of Numbers 13, believing that an analysis of the word *nephilim* in context will help us to determine its true meaning.

Numbers 13:25-33 takes up the story begun in the early chapters of the book of Exodus, where Moses is in the process of leading the Israelites from their Egyptian serfdom eastward toward the “promised land”, at the time called the land of Canaan, now the state of Israel. Prior to attacking the land and dispossessing its inhabitants Moses sent out spies to survey the land, intending to estimate the chances of success for the intended invasion. Numbers 13:25-33 describes their return:

25. When they returned from spying out the land, at the end of forty days
26. They proceeded to come to Moses and Aaron and to all the congregation and showed them the fruit of the land.
27. Thus they told him, and said, “We went in to the land where you sent us; and it certainly does flow with milk and honey, and this is its fruit.
28. “Nevertheless, the people who live in the land are strong, and the cities are fortified and very large; and moreover, we saw the descendants of Anak there.
29. “Amalek is living in the land of the Negev and the Hittites and the Jebusites and the Amorites are living in the hill country, and the Canaanites are living by the sea and by the side of the Jordan.”
30. Then Caleb quieted the people before Moses, and said, “We should by all means go up and take possession of it, for we shall surely overcome it.”
31. But the men who had gone up with him said, “We are not able to go up against the people, for they are too strong for us.”

32. So they gave out to the sons of Israel a bad report of the land which they had spied out, saying, “The land through which we have gone, in spying it out, is a land that devours its inhabitants; and all the people whom we saw in it are men of *great* size (lit. מְדוּת אַנְשֵׁי = *anshe middoth* = “men of measure/stature”).

33. There also we saw the *nephilim* (the sons of Anak are part of the *nephilim*); and we became like grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight. Numbers 13:25-33

Note that a contrast here is made between “men of great stature” (*anshe middoth*), apparently a reference to the majority of occupants of the land of Canaan, and the *nephilim*, a term which expressly includes the “sons of Anak”, an extended family group known for its unprecedented size, deserving of the title “giants” in other contexts in the Hebrew Bible. This is precisely the same contrast that is made in Genesis 6:4 between the *gibborim*, the offspring of the physical union of the “sons of God” and “daughters of men”, and the *nephilim*, and this parallel strengthens our argument that the term *nephilim* is not a synonym for either *anshe middot* in Numbers 13:32-33 or *gibborim* in Genesis 6:4. The contrast rather suggests to this author that the Hebrew term *nephilim* is a generic term, with application to a broad range of subjects, not just humans.” It is the context that allows the exegete to determine the nature of the antecedent of the term. In the context of Numbers 13 the antecedent is a human family group whose progenitor was a man named Anak. Thus *nephilim* can be fairly translated by the term “giants”, with the understanding that in this context at least it refers to humans of extraordinary height. But if applied to animals generally it probably means something like “animals of atypical height or size”, ie. “giant creatures”.

Thus far we have presented only **literary/syntactical** and **contextual** arguments for identifying the *nephilim* in Genesis 6:4 as “giant beings”, or “giant creatures”, distinct from the *gibborim*. We have argued that the **syntax** of Genesis 6:1-8 clearly distinguishes the *nephilim* and the *gibborim*, though they existed at the same time, one providing the temporal context for the emergence of the other. But there is a more fundamental reason for interpreting *nephilim* in Genesis 6:4 as a reference to “giant creatures” and to plausibly identify them as dinosaurs. That reason deserves to be highlighted.

Assuming we have correctly determined that all animal life on earth was created by God around the year 4000 BC, it is a virtual certainty that around the year 3000 BC the earth would be populated by the giant creatures we know today as dinosaurs. There is no mystery in their emergence. They began life as reptiles no larger than lizards and it took them a thousand years to grow to their mammoth size. And that gigantic size is what prompted the writer of the Genesis 6 narrative to point to the emergence of the largest dinosaurs as a distinctive feature of the time when the “sons of god” and the “daughters of men” formed their illicit unions.

If *nephilim* in Genesis 6:4 means “giant creatures” distinct from the *gibborim* “men of stature”, and if the reference is intended to assist the reader in determining the time frame when the *gibborim* were born, then we would expect that these *nephilim* must be a recognizable, identifiable animal family, genus or species, ones which would be naturally dated to late in the antediluvian time frame, i.e. ones which would not have existed fully developed in the days immediately following God’s creation of the animal kingdom. The giant creatures we call dinosaurs admirably fit these requirements. Their size would necessarily be a function of their longevity, the inevitable result of hundreds of years of slow but steady growth. And as every reader of this paper will readily acknowledge, they are clearly the most recognizable “giant creatures” this world has ever known. Thus we argue the following:

1) We should not question the choice of the Hebrew term *nephilim* to reference the giant creatures we know as dinosaurs. What else would we expect to find in a Hebrew text to reference the mammoth dinosaurs than a term which seems to mean nothing more nor less than “giant creature”. Even in the English language the term “dinosaur” is relatively recent, it being the case that prior to the discovery of dinosaur skeletal remains, similarly large animals depicted in [mythological tales and related artifacts](#) and in [multiple cave drawings and other artistic representations of “dinosaur like creatures”](#) were generally referenced simply as “dragons”. For the record we note that the term “dinosaur” was not coined until the year 1842. As noted in the [Wikipedia article on the dinosaur](#):

The taxon **Dinosauria** was formally named in 1842 by paleontologist Sir Richard Owen, who used it to refer to the "distinct tribe or sub-order of Saurian Reptiles" that were then being recognized in England and around the world. The term is derived from the Greek words δεινός (*deinos*, meaning "terrible", "potent", or "fearfully great") and σαῦρος (*sauros*, meaning "lizard" or "reptile"). Though the taxonomic name has often been interpreted as a reference to dinosaurs' teeth, claws, and other fearsome characteristics, Owen intended it merely to evoke their size and majesty.

2) In this paper we are restricting our discussion to the most massive dinosaurs, it being the case that over 90% of all ancient dinosaur species were relatively small, hardly distinguishable from the largest reptiles or the largest mammals known to exist today, and hardly deserving of the title "giants". For this reason, and to limit our discussion to a few pages, we select for examination the sub-orders of the dinosaur family known as [Sauropoda](#), the largest of the dinosaur clans, which includes the familiar genera known as [Brachiosaurus](#), [Diplodocus](#), [Apatosaurus](#) and [Brontosaurus](#) (though presently the latter two are considered to be variations of the same genera). In particular we isolate for discussion the [Brontosaurus](#), it being one of the most notable examples. The largest known *Brontosaurus* is estimated to have weighed around 1000 metric tons and measured upwards of 22 metres (72ft) in length, ranking this creature among the largest land animals known to have existed on the earth. And in reference to this creature, without doubt one of the animals referenced in Genesis 6:4 by the term *nephilim*, we ask a simple question. **How long did it take for this creature to attain its massive size?**

3) To answer the last question we begin by noting two facts on which scientists are in universal agreement, namely, 1) that the [Sauropods](#) were all part of the [Saurischia](#) reptilian order (or [clade](#)) of dinosaurs, and that 2) like the current generation of reptiles and unlike humans and most other contemporary animal phyla, ***Sauropods never stopped growing***. There is no way of knowing how fast they grew at various stages of life, but those periods of varying growth (growth spurts to use a more familiar phrase) are clearly represented in the bone structure of their skeletal remains by concentric rings of alternating density, known as LAGs (= lines of arrested growth, also known as [Harris lines](#)).

[We interject here to caution the reader that modern scientists have grossly misinterpreted these bands of alternating density in cross sections of dinosaur bones. In truth, there is no way of determining what caused these variations in density, much less the duration of time represented by each of these bands. Add to that the fact that [resorption of bone material](#) by the living animal precludes our knowing even how many variations in density actually took place during the animal's life. The bottom line is this - there is no scientific means of determining the life span of a given dinosaur via an analysis of its bones.]

We leave it to the reader to do a google search and study the issue for himself/herself. And for the sufficiently interested reader we suggest that “everything you wanted to know about the growth of the Sauropod dinosaurs but were afraid to ask” can be found in the Cambridge Philosophical Society’s online book length article entitled the “[Biology of the sauropod dinosaurs: the evolution of gigantism](#)”. We bypass much of this material for two simple reasons. On the one hand it is entirely conjectural. And on the other hand it disregards entirely the fact that there is a world of difference between knowledge gleaned from study of the current generation of plants and animals, where cosmic radiation levels are high and lifespans are relatively short, and the conditions that actually prevailed in the antediluvian time frame where the nephilim/sauropod dinosaurs actually lived, a situation discussed in our next point.

4) While we believe it is impossible to determine the lifespan of the dinosaurs from an analysis of their bones, there is an alternate approach to age determination that seems reasonable, and that does take into account the unique conditions that prevailed in the antediluvian age. The second sentence in the introductory paragraph of an online article entitled “[Dinosaurs: How long did they live?](#)” adequately sums up the method.

It isn't easy to tell from dinosaurs' fossilized remains how long they lived. **"Traditional" estimates based on slow, reptilian growth rates, combined with the enormous size of dinosaurs, led scientists to conclude it could be up to several hundred years.**

In the opinion of this author the “traditional method”, which the author of the article proceeds to disparage, is not only the best method, it is the only viable

method, providing we take into account the fact that conditions in the antediluvian world were different than those which prevail today. Thus we suggest a two step approach to the question at hand.

We begin by estimating, based on existing “slow, reptilian growth rates”, how long it might take a Sauropod which weighs approximately 10 lbs at birth to increase its body mass to [1000 metric tons](#) at the time of death (= 1 million kilograms = roughly 2.2046 million lbs) or to increase its length from approximately 1 ft. to 72 ft, employing here the statistics we cited for the Brontosaurus on the bottom of page 9 above. Since we have no quarrel with the “several hundred year” estimate attributed to “scientists” in the quoted sentence, we will simply use that number, which if anything sounds like a lowball figure.

[We interject a second time to clarify one statistic in the preceding paragraph. Lest the reader dispute our estimate that the dinosaurs began life approximately a foot in length and with a mass of about 10 lbs. we refer the reader to the Wikipedia article on [dinosaur eggs](#) and include below several online photos of such, consistent with the adage that a picture is worth a thousand words.]



Resuming our argument, we now introduce our second step, the application of a “scaling factor”, based on our belief that the “slow, reptilian growth rates” observable in the 21st century were even slower in the 4114-2458 BC time frame when the dinosaurs were alive. How much slower is the question? And there is only one way to find out, and that is to compare the growth rate of humans in the

present age to their growth rate in the antediluvian age. This we can do, at least approximately, because for humans the Hebrew Bible provides some data.

With one exception the text of Genesis tells us nothing about the time taken for animals to grow to maturity in the antediluvian age. Only in the case of humans are we informed, albeit imperfectly, regarding sexual development. In Genesis 5 we are provided with statistics that tell us that human growth to sexual maturity in the time frame 4114-2458 BC took *at minimum* 65 years, that being the age at which Enoch had what was presumably his first child (Genesis 5:21). Likewise Enoch's grandfather Mahalalel begat Enoch's father Jared at age 65, and Enoch's great-grandfather Kenan fathered Mahalalel at age 70. Other pre-diluvian patriarchs conceived their first-born much later in life, presumably long after reaching sexual maturity, for reasons not specified in the biblical text. In the case of Methusaleh (187 years) and Noah (500 years), both of whom lived in the age of the large dinosaurs and the *gibborim*, we can only guess at the fact that the prevailing social chaos influenced their decision to remain celibate, or that God Himself, for reasons known only to Him, intervened in the reproductive process, as He is known to have done in the case of Abraham in the postdiluvian world (see Genesis 17:17). What we learn from these statistics is reasonably clear. In today's world humans grow to both physical maturity and sexual maturity around the same time, a process that takes roughly fifteen years, give or take one or two years. We presume that in the pre-flood world also human growth to both physical and sexual maturity took approximately the same time, and from the statistics cited in the Hebrew Bible the process took around 65-70 years, somewhere between 4 and 5 times what it takes today. We assume, admittedly without additional evidence, that the environmental conditions that slowed the rate of physical growth in humans also affected the maturation process in the animal kingdom generally, and that of reptiles in particular, with one major difference. In the case of humans physical growth had its limits, and ceased with the advent of sexual maturity. In the case of the reptiles it didn't. They kept growing, albeit at a rate four to five times slower than they would if living under 20th century atmospheric conditions. And if so, it follows that the Brontosaurus we cited on page 9 of this paper did not reach its enormous dimensions after 200 years of growth. The process would have taken four to five times as long, somewhere between 800 and 1000 years.

With that last statement we rest our case regarding the identity of the *nephilim*. When we combine the **literary/syntactical** and **contextual** arguments presented on the first eight pages of this paper, with the admittedly brief summary of the **physical evidence** which suggests that the dinosaurs did in fact reach their imposing stature 800-1000 years after their creation on day 6 of the creation week, we cannot be faulted for identifying the *nephilim* in Genesis 6:4 with the “giant creatures” we now refer to as dinosaurs.

Time now to turn our attention to the “sons of God”.

B. The meaning of “sons of God”.

Regarding the identity of the “sons of God” there are two opinions, namely that 1) they are angels, reprobate (or “fallen”) in the sense that they are now engaged in unsanctioned behavior offensive to God; or 2) they are humans, descendants of Adam who remain faithful to the creator God, engaged in a sexual union with apostates, an intermarriage of the faithful and the unfaithful, a union prohibited throughout both the Old and New Testaments.

There are literally hundreds of on-line articles which discuss the identity of the “sons of God” in Genesis 6:2 and 6:4, and we quote below only three paragraphs from [one chosen at random](#):

There are two main views concerning the identity of those “sons of God.” They were either fallen angels, i.e. demons, or they were men descended from Adam’s grandson, Enosh, who were faithful to the LORD (YAWEH).

First, let’s consider the view that they were fallen angels. In the Old Testament angels are sometimes referred to as “sons of God” (cf. Job 1:6 KJV or NASB). So, in Genesis 6 if the “sons of God” were angels, what was happening was some of the angels were taking human women, “the daughters of men,” and they were bearing offspring together (Gen 6:4). Such an unnatural union is truly bizarre, and that interpretation is supported by the notion that these offspring were quite unusual. They were “giants” as the KJV translates, or “Nephilim” in the NASB and NIV. There are also two passages in the New Testament which seem to refer to the circumstances described in Genesis 6, they are 2nd Peter 2:4-8 and Jude 5-8. We are told in these epistles, “angels when they sinned” (Peter), and “angels who did not keep their own domain” (Jude) were judged by God. In Jude especially, the comparison is drawn between the angels’ improper activity and the gross

immorality of Sodom and Gomorrah when they “went after strange flesh.” These observations, taken together with what is recorded about the wicked conditions which resulted on Earth in the days of Noah, form a convincing argument for the interpretation that the “sons of God” are fallen angels.

Second, let’s consider the view that they were the descendants of Enosh, men who were faithful to God. The Bible tells us that in the days of Enosh, “men began to call upon the name of the LORD (Gen 4:26).” This interpretation explains that it was these men who were being referred to as the “sons (children) of God” in Genesis 6, in the same sense that John describes those who are born of God (John 1:12-13). Paul also explains the true identity of the sons/children of God in Romans 8:14 and 9:4-8, even applying that description to the Israelites of the Old Testament times (cf. Moses’ description, Deut 32:5-6). So, in Genesis 6, if the “sons of God” are men, what is happening is God’s people, the believers we might say, are intermarrying with unbelievers. The tragic result was the dilution of the influence of righteousness in society until, in the days of Noah, God said to Noah, “you alone I have seen righteous before Me in this generation (Gen 7:1).” This interpretation has the advantage of not having to explain how demons, spirit-beings with no material substance (e.g. no DNA or cellular components), could procreate with human beings. It also is consistent with and forms the foundation for a principle taught throughout God’s Word, the extreme importance of marrying only within the family of God (Exo 34:11-16, 2nd Cor 6:14-18). The Bible relates many tragic lessons from the lives of those who did not heed God’s prohibition of “spiritual intermarriage,” e.g. Esau, Samson, Solomon. If the “sons of God” were indeed men, Genesis 6 teaches us the sobering lesson that mankind didn’t require the “help” of demons to plunge into such debauchery and violence that God said of Man, “every intent of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually (Gen 6:5).”

Let us be clear at the outset. A legitimate argument can be proposed in defense of either of the two interpretive positions. Thus we can lend our support to either view. We are clearly not dealing here with an instance of biblical integrity, the subject matter which most concerns this series of papers. But if we are to take sides on the issue, we choose to identify the “sons of God” with angelic beings, in spite of the fact that it is the most problematic of the two interpretations and certainly the most unusual/bizarre. The most difficult interpretive issue in this identification, the one cited by the article quoted above, is how angels, supposedly sexless beings, could physically cohabit with human females to produce offspring, an issue we will take only two paragraphs to discuss.

It should not be difficult for Christians, who take the Bible at face value, and interpret the New Testament reference to the “[virgin birth](#)” of Jesus as factual, to

believe that the “daughters of men” are capable of producing offspring without the contribution of sperm from human males. The question at hand is whether angels possessed the requisite knowledge, authority, or power to effect the same result. Sufficient here to recall the fact that the universe of angelic “beings” is described throughout the Old and New Testaments as a group possessed with superior knowledge and intellect sufficient to carry out the multiple tasks assigned them by God, under his authority, and with his delegated power. They may well have been able to cause women to conceive without male participation. None of the language that appears in Genesis 6:1-8 demands that we view this cohabitation of the angels and humans as a sexual union, in the sense that physical intercourse is demanded. The language employed in the Hebrew Bible is ambivalent, and open to interpretation. Genesis 6:1-8 speaks about the angels taking wives for themselves (verse 2), or it states that “the sons of God *came to* the daughters of man” (not “came in to” as translated in the NASB), both phrases implying cohabitation (dwelling together), but neither demanding sexual union, i.e. intercourse.

We might simply leave the matter there, and let the reader do his/her own research on the matter. But in the original version of this paper I suggested that perhaps “one day science may provide an answer” to the question of how sexless angels could produce offspring in human females. Thus the casual reader of this paper might be interested in an article entitled [“Artificial embryos” in the journal “MIT Technology Review”](#). If nothing else the article tells us that our knowledge of the reproductive process is far from complete. The article describes how British scientists have managed to create living embryos not only without sperm from the male, but without either male sperm or female eggs. All that is needed is stem cells from an existing human embryo and the requisite technological skill. Thus far the process has been demonstrated to be viable only in mice, but the science, if the reports are accurate, does suggest that our interpretation of the Genesis 6 story is at minimum scientifically plausible.

Our support for the position that “sons of god” actually refers to angels is based entirely on an “oral tradition” partially preserved in a [pseudepigraphical](#) book by the name “1 Enoch”, a.k.a. [“the book of Enoch”](#). With regard to this oral tradition, and in support of our contention that the world populated by the

descendants of Noah actually knew a great deal about the antediluvian civilization and passed this folklore on to subsequent generations, on page 7 of our third paper we made the following statement, one which bears repetition here:

Curious inquirers, and of course hostile critics, often question how the details of the creation account in Genesis chapters 1 & 2, and the endless genealogical details that followed, not to mention the story of the flood, of the confusion of tongues, and the genealogical details of the early postdiluvian world, were transmitted to future generations. Those questions and many more find a ready answer in our Figure 1 & 2 timelines. We note, first of all, that even if the story line was transmitted orally, we are not looking at an endless chain of story tellers. According to the Hebrew Bible Adam lived 930 years, from 4114 BC through to 3184 BC. Methuselah, his g-g-g-g-grandson, was born in 3427 BC and died in 2458 BC, the year of the great flood. Their lives overlapped for a total of 243 years, more than enough time for Methuselah to have heard the story of creation so many times he was sick of hearing it. And without doubt he could name his father, grandfather and his five great grandfathers by his second birthday. Of course we speak with tongue in cheek, but the reader no doubt gets the point. Everyone in the latter years of the antediluvian/prediluvian/pre-flood world probably knew the details recorded in the early chapters of Genesis by heart, and without doubt could recite from memory further details sufficient to fill a book.

And we could add to that final sentence that all of the occupants of the late antediluvian world, including Noah and his three sons, undoubtedly knew the most intimate details of the Genesis 6:1-8 incident, volumes more than were later condensed into eight verses of the sixth chapter of Genesis. And we should not be surprised to learn that some of these added details were later passed on by Noah and his sons to their descendants, and were eventually preserved in writing, a supplement, so to speak, to the Genesis material. One of these later collections of supplemental material made its way into print among the Jewish descendants of Abraham who emigrated around the time of king David into Ethiopia, where the amplified version of the Genesis 6:1-8 incident proved to be immensely popular and was thus preserved for generations following, unfortunately becoming extremely distorted/mythologized over time, not to mention cluttered with masses of extraneous and unrelated ramblings not worth the reading. This collection of folklore was preserved intact in an Ethiopian context for centuries. Ethiopian Jews are credited with preserving Jewish traditions and artifacts of extreme antiquity, including the arc of the covenant. There is no reason to doubt

that they also preserved fragments of oral tradition concerning the antediluvian world.

According to this preserved tradition, the Genesis 6 story does concern the cohabitation of angels and humans, and additionally the fact that it took place in the time of Jared, g-g-grandfather of Noah, and thus also in the time of Enoch, Jared's son. And since Enoch is said to have witnessed the entire affair and verbally condemned the participants, the collected memories were preserved in a book attributed to his authorship, clearly a falsehood and hence its classification among the large collection of Old Testament [pseudepigrapha](#). Fortunately the "book of Enoch", lost to the world for centuries, has been re-discovered in recent times, in one instance in an almost intact Ethiopic translation.

Our interest in 1 Enoch is restricted to the earliest chapters of the book, those which repeat in amazing detail the story of the angelic/human cohabitation, and those which are the least likely to have been embellished with superfluous details over the nearly 4500 years which separate our 21st century from the time of Noah. While the entire book in English translation is preserved online, we are here interested only in the content of chapters 6-9, which for convenience as well as security of access we duplicate here from R.H. Charles' classic treatment of the [Book of Enoch](#):

VI-XI. *The Fall of the Angels: the Demoralisation of Mankind: the Intercession of the Angels on behalf of Mankind. The Dooms pronounced by God on the Angels: the Messianic Kingdom* (a Noah fragment).

CHAPTER VI.

1. And it came to pass when the children of men had multiplied that in those days were born unto them beautiful and comely daughters. 2. And the angels, the children of the heaven, saw and lusted after them, and said to one another: 'Come, let us choose us wives from among the children of men and beget us children.' 3. And Semjâzâ, who was their leader, said unto them: 'I fear ye will not indeed agree to do this deed, and I alone shall have to pay the penalty of a great sin.' 4. And they all answered him and said: 'Let us all swear an oath, and all bind ourselves by mutual imprecations not to abandon this plan but to do this thing.' 5. Then sware they all together and bound themselves by mutual imprecations upon it. 6. And they were in all two hundred; who descended [in the days] of **Jared** on the summit of Mount Hermon, and they called it Mount Hermon, because they had sworn and bound themselves by mutual imprecations upon it. 7. And these are the names of their leaders: Sêmîazâz, their leader,

Arâkîba, Râmêêl, Kôkabîêl, Tâmîêl, Râmîêl, Dânêl, Êzêqêêl, Barâqîjâl, Asêel, Armârôs, Batârêl, Anânêl, Zaqîêl, Samsâpêêl, Satarêl, Tûrêl, Jômjâêl, Sariêl. 8. These are their chiefs of tens.

CHAPTER VII.

1. And all the others together with them took unto themselves wives, and each chose for himself one, and they began to go in unto them and to defile themselves with them, and they taught them charms and enchantments, and the cutting of roots, and made them acquainted with plants. 2. And they became pregnant, and they bare great giants, whose height was three thousand ells: 3. Who consumed all the acquisitions of men. And when men could no longer sustain them, 4. the giants turned against them and devoured mankind. 5. And they began to sin against birds, and beasts, and reptiles, and fish, and to devour one another's flesh, and drink the blood. 6. Then the earth laid accusation against the lawless ones.

CHAPTER VIII.

1. And Azâzêl taught men to make swords, and knives, and shields, and breastplates, and made known to them **the metals** of the earth and the art of working them, and bracelets, and ornaments, and the use of antimony, and the beautifying of the eyelids, and all kinds of costly stones, and all colouring tinctures. 2. And there arose much godlessness, and they committed fornication, and they were led astray, and became corrupt in all their ways. Semjâzâ taught enchantments, and root-cuttings, Armârôs the resolving of enchantments, Barâqîjâl, (taught) astrology, Kôkabêl the constellations, **Ezêqêel the knowledge of the clouds**, Araqiêl the signs of the earth, Shamsiêl the signs of the sun, and Sariêl the course of the moon. And as men perished, they cried, and their cry went up to heaven . . .

CHAPTER IX.

1. And then Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel looked down from heaven and saw much blood being shed upon the earth, and all lawlessness being wrought upon the earth. 2. And they said one to another: 'The earth made †without inhabitant cries the voice of their crying† up to the gates of heaven. 3. **[[And now to you, the holy ones of heaven]]**, the souls of men make their suit, saying, "Bring our cause before the Most High." 4. And they said to the Lord **of the ages**: 'Lord of lords, God of gods, King of kings, **<and God of the ages>**, the throne of Thy glory (standeth) unto all the generations of the ages, and Thy name holy and glorious and blessed unto all the ages! 5. Thou hast made all things, and power over all things hast Thou: and all things are naked and open in Thy sight, and Thou seest all things, and nothing can hide itself from Thee. 6. Thou seest what Azâzêl hath done, who hath taught all unrighteousness on earth and revealed the eternal secrets which were (preserved) in heaven, which men were striving to **learn**: 7. And Semjâzâ, to whom Thou hast given authority to bear rule over his associates. 8. And they have gone to the daughters of men upon the earth, and have slept with the women, and have defiled themselves, and revealed to them all kinds of sins. 9. And the women have borne giants, and the whole earth has thereby been filled with blood and unrighteousness. 10. And now, behold, the souls of those who have died are crying and making their suit to the gates

of heaven, and their lamentations have ascended: and cannot **cease** because of the lawless deeds which are wrought on the earth. 11. And Thou knowest all things before they come to pass, and Thou seest these things and Thou dost suffer them, and Thou dost not say to us what we are to do to them in regard to these.'

In reproducing these early chapters from the book of Enoch we are certainly not endorsing the whole of their content. In fact we have already clearly objected to key aspects of the book's interpretation of events, including the assumption of physical intercourse between the angels and humans, and the fact that the resulting progeny grew to be giants. There is therefore absolutely no question that the Genesis story has been mythologized/distorted and that much of the content of the book of Enoch, particularly as we progress through the book, should be taken with a proverbial "[grain of salt](#)." But the reader should also be aware that the book, or at least a segment of the early chapters, was certainly accessible to and apparently widely read in the early centuries of the Christian church, and several passages in it have been either quoted or paraphrased in various N.T. contexts. In particular, some of the New Testament teaching about the coming judgment of fallen angels/demons, not quoted in the above segment, seem to be derived from the content of the early chapters of the Book of Enoch. In later papers in this series we will have cause to comment on some of this teaching. Here we are concerned with only one aspect of the Enoch story. We are of the school of thought that almost all mythology is based on some factual foundation, and in the case of Enoch it is evident that the foundation is the biblical text of Genesis 6:1-8. At the very least, the book seems to preserve a tradition that the "sons of god" are angels and that some unsanctioned interaction between angels and humans seriously corrupted human civilization and angered god. More than that we are not prepared to say, except for the fact that the book of Enoch definitely authenticates our dating the incident, associating the event with Enoch. And since we have dated this antediluvian patriarch in the time frame 3492-3127 BC, and since the descent of the angels is dated in the book of Enoch to the last years of Enoch's life on earth, ca 3127 BC, this book seems to provide a fairly precise dating of the Genesis 6 story, suggesting, as did our analysis of the emergence of the large dinosaurs, that it took place a thousand years into the antediluvian age.

C. The meaning of “gibborim”.

Our goal was to complete this 5th paper in twenty pages or less. Our primary objective was to demonstrate that the Hebrew Bible does describe the presence on earth of the mammoth dinosaurs, and to explain their growth from foot long hatchlings, created on day 6 of the creation week, 4114 BC, to the gigantic 72 foot long creatures that existed in the latter years of the life of Enoch, thus around the year 3127 BC. This determination consumed almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of our allotted space. Another $\frac{1}{4}$ was consumed discussing the identity of the “sons of god” in Genesis 6: 2&4. Here we sided with the majority of exegetes, and identified them as rebellious/renege angels, based largely on an assumed reliability of material in the early chapters of the pseudepigraphical book of Enoch. The mathematically adept reader will note that we have no space left to discuss the *gibborim*. Fortunately none is needed.

The term *gibborim* is the generic Hebrew word for “mighty man”/“valiant warrior”. It is used hundreds of times in this identical sense in the Hebrew Bible. In none of these instances does it ever refer to giants.

In the *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* it is said that

gibbor, with the doubling of the middle radical, is an intensive form, and thus means a particularly strong or mighty person who carries out, can carry out, or has carried out great deeds, and surpasses others in doing so. Therefore the usual translation is “hero,” especially in military activities. TDOT II:373

Only among interpreters of the text of Genesis 6:4 has it ever been suggested that the term *gibbor* was used in reference to a giant, and here, as in all other instances where the term is used, the fact of giantism is not implied in the word itself. That inference is determined from the context, and in particular the faulty association of the terms *nephilim* and *gibborim*.

As always, let the reader decide if we are right.